

REMARKS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and Applicants respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and again examine the claims as amended.

The Applicants affirm the restriction requirement imposed by the Examiner without traverse and elected to prosecute Claims 1-6 and 10-15. Accordingly, the Claims 7-9 have been canceled.

Claims 1-6 and 12 -15 were rejected due to informalities and because of their dependency to an objected base claim. Applicants have amended the claims if view of the Examiner remarks.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,373,831 to Secord et al. Claims 2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,373,831 to Secord et al. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord et al in view of Steele U.S. Patent No. 4,393,276. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,393,276 to Steele. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Secord in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,731 to Huang.

Applicants note that Claims 13 -15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Applicants have amended Claim 13 to include the limitations of Claim 11 and Claim 13 should now be allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentable over Secord et al, since Secord et al neither describes nor suggests "... an interleaver to map each one of the plurality of symbol blocks into a plurality of coherent subbands wherein each symbol block is segmented into a plurality of symbols with each one of the plurality of symbols grouped into sets of symbols, and each set of

symbols is mapped to one of the plurality of coherent subbands".

As Claims 2 through 6 depend from Claim 1 and cite additional structure, they too are allowable for analogous reasons.

Independent Claim 10 is neither described nor suggested by the references since the references taken separately or in combination neither describe nor suggest the steps of "... interleaving the symbol blocks across a plurality of coherent subbands wherein each symbol block is segmented into a plurality of symbols with each one of the plurality of symbols grouped into sets of symbols, and each set of symbols is mapped to one of the plurality of coherent subbands; ..."

Applicants have submitted herewith a Petition for an Extension of Time for three (3) months with authorization to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 500845 to cover the costs of the petition.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Accordingly, re-examination and reconsideration are requested in view of the above amendment and remarks.

Appl. No. 09/802,280
Reply to Office Action of April 19, 2005

Docket No. RTN-098AUS

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Amendment or this application, he or she is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-12-05

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By: Donald F. Mofford

Donald F. Mofford
Reg. No. 33,740
Attorney for Applicant(s)
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 13
Fax: (781) 401-9966
dfm@dc-m.com

\server01\client_files\Prolaw documents\RTN-098AUS\10220.doc

Page 7 of 7